Journal of Marketing Research
Annotated Subject Index and Author/Title Index
Volume XXVI, 1989

ANNOTATED SUBJECT INDEX 493
Advertising and Media Research 493
Attitude Theory Research 494
Brand Choice 494
Buyer Behavior 495
Econometric Models 496
Industrial Marketing 496
Information Processing 497
International Marketing 497
Marketing Management 497
Measurement 497
New Product Research 497
Pricing Research 497
Regression and Other Statistical Techniques 498
Research Design 498
Research Ethics 498
Salesforce Research 498
Sampling and Survey Methods 499
Scaling Methods 499
Segmentation Research 499
Social Issues and Public Policy 499
Strategy and Planning 500
AUTHOR/TITLE INDEX 500
BOOKS AND SOFTWARE REVIEWED 502

ADVERTISING AND MEDIA RESEARCH

An Approximate Log-Linear Model for Predicting Magazine Audiences, PETER J. DANAHER, November, 473–479.
See "Econometric Models"

Assessing the Role of Contingency Awareness in Attitudinal Conditioning With Implications for Advertising Research, CHRIS T. ALLEN and CHRIS A. JANISZEWSKI, February, 30–43.

The authors investigate a basic mechanism for shaping attitudes that has largely been ignored by empirical researchers in the marketing discipline. Two experiments are reported in which traditional Pavlovian procedures are merged with a view of conditioning that encourages theorizing about attendant cognitive processes. The data indicate that contingency learning or awareness may be a requirement for successful attitudinal conditioning. Contingency awareness entails conscious recognition of the relational pattern between the conditioned and unconditioned stimuli used in a conditioning procedure. In experiment 1, the conditioning procedure affected the evaluative judgments of subjects who were classified (*post hoc*) as contingency aware. In experiment 2, instructions that promoted contingency learning as part of the procedure again influenced participants' attitude judgments. Implications are offered for theory development and for constructing advertisements to foster attitudinal conditioning. Specific suggestions for further research on how one might structure television commercials to foster contingency learning also are presented.

Shaping the Route to Attitude Change: Central Versus Peripheral Processing Through Comparative Versus Noncomparative Advertising, CORNELIA DRÖGE, May, 193–204.

A two-group LISREL model was used to test the hypothesis that comparative ads tend to be processed centrally whereas noncomparative ads tend to be processed peripherally. Results show that A_{Ad} is a significant predictor of A_B only in the noncomparative case, whereas A_B-conation consistency is higher for comparative ads.

The Competitive Implications of Relevant-Set/Response Analysis, JOHN R. HAUSER and BIRGER WERNERFELT, November, 391–405.

Consumers choose from a relevant set of brands. Advertising encourages consumers to consider a brand as relevant. Price and other variables influence consumer choice among relevant brands. The authors examine how the explicit consideration of competitive response affects managerial recommendations and explore the interaction between price and advertising decisions. They consider cases in which managers do and in which they do not anticipate competitive actions.

The Impact of Feelings on Ad-Based Affect and Cognition, MARIAN CHAPMAN BURKE and JULIE A. EDELL, February, 69–83.

The authors examine the relationships among feelings generated by new television ads for unfamiliar products, judgments of the ads' characteristics, brand attribute evaluations, attitude toward the ad, and attitude toward the brand in a simultaneous equation model. Feelings affect attitude toward the ad and attitude toward the brand directly and indirectly. The particular effects of three different dimensions of feelings—upbeat, warm, and negative—are identified. The results are robust to multiple viewings of the ad, different measurement delay periods, and the particular ad seen.

The Information Processing of Coordinated Media Campaigns, JULIE A. EDELL and KEVIN LANE KELLER, May, 149–163.

Marketers are increasingly coordinating their advertising campaigns across media. The authors use information processing theory to examine consumer response to coordinated TV and radio ads. "Radio replay" is defined to occur when a consumer views a TV ad and later hears the audio track from the TV ad as a radio ad.

Journal of Marketing Research
Vol. XXVI (November 1989), 493–502

The outcomes from radio replay are posited to depend on the relative extent of comprehension, retrieval, and elaborative processes that consumers undertake during the reinforcing radio ad exposure. The results of a laboratory experiment examining coordinated radio and TV ads show that when consumers heard a radio replay, they did very little critical, evaluative processing. Rather, they appeared to replay mentally the video from the television ad. Recall results are consistent with this processing. Judgments of the ads and the brands, however, are as positive for radio replay as they are for the television repetition condition. Implications of these findings for advertising theory and practice are discussed.

ATTITUDE THEORY RESEARCH

Assessing the Role of Contingency Awareness in Attitudinal Conditioning With Implications for Advertising Research, CHRIS T. ALLEN and CHRIS A. JANISZEWSKI, February, 30–43.
See "Advertising and Media Research"

Shaping the Route to Attitude Change: Central Versus Peripheral Processing Through Comparative Versus Noncomparative Advertising, CORNELIA DRÖGE, May, 193–204.
See "Advertising and Media Research"

The Impact of Feelings on Ad-Based Affect and Cognition, MARIAN CHAPMAN BURKE and JULIE A. EDELL, February, 69–83.
See "Advertising and Media Research"

BRAND CHOICE

An Alternative Explanation for Lower Repeat Rates After Promotion Purchases, SCOTT A. NESLIN and ROBERT W. SHOEMAKER, May, 205–213.
See "Buyer Behavior"

Confirmatory Analysis of Aggregate Hierarchical Market Structures: Inferences From Brand-Switching Behavior, AJITH KUMAR and C. M. SASHI, November, 444–453.
See "Econometric Models"

Consumer Preference Formation and Pioneering Advantage, GREGORY S. CARPENTER and KENT NAKAMOTO, August, 285–298.
See "Buyer Behavior"

Reference Effects of Price and Promotion on Brand Choice Behavior, JAMES M. LATTIN and RANDOLPH E. BUCKLIN, August, 299–310.

When consumers are exposed to pricing and promotional activity by frequently purchased packaged goods, they may develop expectations that are used as points of reference in evaluating future activity. The authors build a model to test for the presence of these reference effects on brand choice behavior. The approach differs from previous research in two ways: (1) the model includes reference effects of promotion in addition to reference effects of price and (2) a threshold model is introduced to capture the formation of the consumer's promotional reference point. The authors calibrate a model of brand choice using IRI scanner panel data on ground coffee. The findings suggest that promotional activity has significant reference effects on consumer response.

The Effect of Price, Brand Name, and Store Name on Buyers' Perceptions of Product Quality: An Integrative Review, AKSHAY R. RAO and KENT B. MONROE, August, 351–357.
See "Buyer Behavior"

The Effects of Brand Positioning Strategies on Consumers' Brand and Category Perceptions: Some Insights From Schema Research, MITA SUJAN and JAMES R. BETTMAN, November, 454–467.

Results of four studies demonstrate that perceptions of how different a brand is from other brands in the product category affect perceptions of the brand's position within the category. Specifically, perceptions that a brand is strongly discrepant result in a subtyped (or niche) position, whereas perceptions that a brand is moderately discrepant result in a differentiated position within the general category. Perceptions of discrepancy are affected both by the extent of discrepancy on an attribute and whether the discrepant information is concentrated in a single ad for the brand or dispersed across multiple ads for the product. The effects associated with a subtyped position, in comparison with a differentiated position, are identified (study 1) and are found to increase with time (study 2). The subtyped versus differentiated distinction for a strongly versus moderately discrepant brand is validated with a sorting task (study 3). This distinction is shown to hold in the context of multiple discrepant brands that differ in their extent of discrepancy (study 4). Implications of the findings for a theoretical understanding of subtyping versus differentiation and for the application of positioning strategies in the marketplace are discussed.

The Effects of Concurrent Verbalization on Choice Processing, GABRIEL BIEHAL and DIPANKAR CHAKRAVARTI, February, 84–96.

Subjects made an initial choice using external product information. Some concurrently verbalized this choice, whereas others did not. Next, they received more information on new brands and a new attribute for all brands. Both verbalizers and nonverbalizers then made a second choice using some of the first choice information incidentally acquired in memory. All subjects verbalized this second choice. The effects of the first choice verbalization manipulation were examined by analyzing the second choice protocols along with the choice outcome and task perception measures. In comparison with verbalizers, nonverbalizers did more problem framing and brand processing during earlier phases of the second choice. However, choice outcomes did not differ. The findings suggest that the verbalization manipulation may have altered the first choice, creating memory differences that affected some subsequent tasks. Retrieval measures corroborate this conclusion. The concurrent verbal protocol method is evaluated on the basis of these findings.

When Choice Models Fail: Compensatory Models in Negatively Correlated Environments, ERIC J. JOHNSON, ROBERT J. MEYER, and SANJOY GHOSE, August, 255–270.

Linear compensatory models, which involve tradeoffs between product attributes, have been argued to provide reasonably good predictions of choices made by noncompensatory heuristics, which do not involve tradeoffs. This robustness to misspecification of functional form may fail, however, when there are negative correlations among attributes in a choice set. A Monté Carlo simulation demonstrates that certain noncompensatory rules are poorly fit by linear models, even in orthogonal environments, and that this fit diminishes further in nonorthogonal environments. Two laboratory experiments assess the extent to which such model failure might arise in natural contexts. The first, a process-tracing analysis, examines the decision strategies consumers use in nonorthogonal choice environments. The second explores the ability of a compensatory choice model calibrated on actual choices to predict decisions made in orthogonal and nonorthogonal contexts. The authors conclude with a discussion of the work's implications for current research in applied choice modeling.

BUYER BEHAVIOR

A Paired Comparison Nested Logit Model of Individual Perference Structures, WILLIAM L. MOORE and DONALD R. LEHMANN, November, 420–428.

See "Econometric Models"

Adjusting Stated Intention Measures to Predict Trial Purchase of New Products: A Comparison of Models and Methods, LINDA F. JAMIESON and FRANK M. BASS, August, 336–345.

See "New Product Research"

An Alternative Explanation for Lower Repeat Rates After Promotion Purchases, SCOTT A. NESLIN and ROBERT W. SHOEMAKER, May, 205–213.

Several authors have observed that average repeat rates are lower after a promotion purchase. One interpretation of this result is that a media-coupon or cents-off promotion undermines the consumer's repeat purchase rate. The authors describe an alternative explanation. The explanation is that the promotion temporarily attracts a disproportionate number of households with low purchase probabilities. When the repeat rates of these households are averaged with the repeat rates of those that would have bought the brand even without a promotion, the average rate after a promotion purchase is lower. This effect is demonstrated by means of a numerical example, a closed-form equation for repeat rates, a Monté Carlo purchase simulation, and a logit choice model. An exploratory empirical analysis supports these arguments. Implications for marketing management, research methodology, and future research are discussed.

An Approach for Tracking Within-Segment Shifts in Market Shares, RAJIV GROVER and V. SRINIVASAN, May, 230–236.

See "Segmentation Research"

Consumer Preference Formation and Pioneering Advantage, GREGORY S. CARPENTER and KENT NAKAMOTO, August, 285–298.

Market pioneers outsell later entrants in both consumer and industrial markets. Entry barriers arising from preemptive positioning and switching costs have been advanced to explain this market share difference, termed "pioneering advantage." However, empirical studies show that pioneering advantages are present even in mature markets in which brands reposition and switching costs are minimal. In these cases, the authors argue that pioneering advantage can arise from the process by which consumers learn about brands and form their preferences. This process can produce a preference structure that favors the pioneer, making it difficult for later entrants to "compete away" the pioneer's large market share, even if brands can reposition and switching costs are minimal.

Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct? C. MIN HAN, May, 222–229.

The author examines the role of country image in consumer evaluations of television sets and automobiles. Specifically, two alternative causal models are developed and tested: (1) the halo model hypothesizing that country image serves as a halo in product evaluation and (2) the summary construct model hypothesizing that country image functions as a summary construct. The test results indicate that when consumers are not familiar with a country's products, country image may serve as a halo from which consumers infer a brand's product attributes and which affects their attitude toward the brand indirectly through product attribute rating. In contrast, as consumers become familiar with a country's products, country image may become a construct that summarizes consumers' beliefs about product attributes and directly affects their attitude toward the brand.

Interactive Impact of Informational and Normative Influences on Donations, STEPHEN A. LaTOUR and AJAY K. MANRAI, August, 327–335.

Two field experiments manipulating informational and normative influence demonstrate that they interact to yield substantial increases in donations. Informational influence involved a message about the positive consequences of donating (e.g., helping to save lives). These results are contrary to those of several prospective correlational studies that found no relationship between these variables and donation behavior.

Mood Manipulation in Marketing Research: An Examination of Potential Confounding Effects, RONALD PAUL HILL and JAMES C. WARD, February, 97–104.

Recently marketing researchers have begun to direct attention to the influence of "mood" on consumer behavior. Researchers generally assume that commonly used mood manipulations produce "converging effects" and do not create confounds with other explanatory variables. The authors question this assumption and show that two different versions of the same mood manipulation are capable of producing comparable mood states that have significantly different effects on subjects' perceived self-efficacy and subsequent decision-making effort. The results suggest that future studies of mood should be designed to better differentiate mood effects from potential confounds.

Organizational Climate and Decision Framing: An Integrated Approach to Analyzing Industrial Buying Decisions, WILLIAM J. QUALLS and CHRISTOPHER P. PUTO, May, 179–192.

See "Industrial Marketing"

Reference Effects of Price and Promotion on Brand Choice Behavior, JAMES M. LATTIN and RANDOLPH E. BUCKLIN, August, 299–310.

See "Brand Choice"

The Competitive Implications of Relevant Set/Response Analysis, JOHN R. HAUSER and BIRGER WERNERFELT, November, 391–405.

See "Advertising and Media Research"

The Effect of Price, Brand Name, and Store Name on Buyers' Perceptions of Product Quality: An Integrative Review, AKSHAY R. RAO and KENT B. MONROE, August, 351–357.

The authors integrate previous research that has investigated experimentally the influence of price, brand name, and/or store name on buyers' evaluations of product quality. The meta-analysis suggests that, for consumer products, the relationships between price and perceived quality and between brand name and perceived quality are positive and statistically significant. However, the positive effect of store name on perceived quality is small and not statistically significant. Further, the type of experimental design and the strength of the price manipulation are shown to significantly influence the observed effect of price on perceived quality.

The Effects of Concurrent Verbalization on Choice Processing, GABRIEL BIEHAL and DIPANKAR CHAKRAVARTI, February, 84–96.

See "Brand Choice"

The Relationship Between Perceived and Objective Price-Quality, DONALD R. LICHTENSTEIN and SCOT BURTON, November, 429–443.

Four studies were conducted to assess the accuracy with which consumers perceive objective price-quality relationships. Results across four studies indicate that, overall, consumers perceive ob-

jective price-quality relationships with only a modest degree of accuracy. However, findings also suggest that the accuracy of consumers' perceptions is moderated by product type; that is, price-quality perceptions are more accurate for nondurable products than for durable products. The authors conclude that consumers' price-quality perceptions appear to be a function of general or product-type-specific schemas, rather than independent evaluations of price-quality relationships for individual product categories.

ECONOMETRIC MODELS

A Bootstrap Procedure for Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indices of Structural Equation and Confirmatory Factor Models, PAULA FITZGERALD BONE, SUBHASH SHARMA, and TERENCE A. SHIMP, February, 105–111.

The authors propose a bootstrap procedure for evaluating the goodness-of-fit indices for structural equation and confirmatory factor models. Monté Carlo simulations are applied to obtain a bootstrap sampling distribution (BSD) for each fit statistic. Then the BSD is used to evaluate model fit. Because the BSD takes into consideration sample size and model characteristics (e.g., number of factors, number of indicators per factor), its application in the proposed procedure makes it possible to compare the fits of competing models. Two previous studies are reanalyzed in illustrating how to implement the proposed procedure.

A Monté Carlo Comparison of Estimators for the Multinomial Logit Model, DAVID S. BUNCH and RICHARD R. BATSELL, February, 56–68.

Marketing researchers use the multinomial logit (MNL) model to analyze discrete choice, and estimate parameters either by maximum likelihood (ML) or minimum logit chi square (MLCS). Some controversy persists, however, over which is better. Review articles in marketing recommend ML over MLCS, but the statistics literature suggests that MLCS should be preferred. No studies have directly compared the performance of ML and MLCS in a marketing context. The authors assess the relative performance of ML, MLCS, and three other candidate estimators for MNL marketing applications involving repeated-measures datasets collected by means of multiple-subset designs. In contrast to most previous findings in the statistics literature, the results strongly support the use of ML. ML is found to outperform the other estimators on a variety of point estimation, predictive accuracy, and statistical inference criteria and ML test statistics are found to have asymptotic behavior for datasets involving relatively few replications.

A Paired Comparison Nested Logit Model of Individual Preference Structures, WILLIAM L. MOORE and DONALD R. LEHMANN, November, 420–428.

Models that rely on the assumption of simple scalability have dominated multiattribute choice and preference modeling for almost 20 years, despite the fact that simple scalability is violated in many instances. Several attempts have been made to construct choice models that do not involve this assumption; however, their application to individual-level analysis has been limited by data requirements and computational problems. Furthermore, few attempts have been made to build similar models of *preference* structures. The authors present a method for analyzing individual-level hierarchical preference structures that is estimated by a nested logit formulation. The method is very tractable with a large number of brands; it requires only paired comparison data and it provides significantly better fits on calibration data and predictions on holdout data than a Luce model for most respondents in an illustrative application.

A Probabilistic Choice Model for Market Segmentation and Elasticity Structure, WAGNER A. KAMAKURA and GARY J. RUSSELL, November, 379–390.

See "Segmentation Research"

An Approximate Log-Linear Model for Predicting Magazine Audiences, PETER J. DANAHER, November, 473–479.

In 1988 Danaher showed a log-linear model to be accurate for predicting magazine exposure distributions. However, the model was expensive on computer time and stored array space when the number of magazines and insertions was large. An approximation to that model is developed that is of comparable accuracy yet takes less than one quarter of the computation time and eliminates the need for a large stored array. The approximate log-linear model is compared empirically with Danaher's previous log-linear model and one of Leckenby and Kishi's Dirichlet-multinomial models for equal-insertion schedules. For unequal-insertion schedules, the approximate log-linear model is compared with the log-linear model and the popular Metheringham beta-binomial model. The results show that, in accuracy, the approximate log-linear model is between the log-linear and Leckenby and Kishi's model for equal insertions and is about the same as the log-linear for unequal-insertion schedules, but is significantly more accurate than Metheringham's model.

Competitive Reactions to Market Entry: Explaining Interfirm Differences, HUBERT GATIGNON, ERIN ANDERSON, and KRISTIAAN HELSEN, February, 44–55.

See "Strategy and Planning"

Confirmatory Analysis of Aggregate Hierarchical Market Structures: Inferences From Brand-Switching Behavior, AJITH KUMAR and C. M. SASHI, November, 444–453.

A probabilistic model is developed for testing hypothesized hierarchical market structures at the aggregate level using brand-switching data. Each hypothesized structure is represented by a directed graph and its parameters are estimated by using log-linear modeling techniques. As an illustration, the method is applied to data on soft drinks.

On the Use of Structural Equation Models in Experimental Designs, RICHARD P. BAGOZZI and YOUJAE YI, August, 271–284.

New procedures are developed and illustrated for the analysis of experimental data with particular emphasis on MANOVA and MANCOVA designs. The authors begin with one-way designs, including overall tests of significance, step-down analyses, and the use of latent variables. Next they describe a general test of homogeneity and consider a procedure that is applicable even under conditions of heterogeneity. Two-way designs then are derived as special cases of the more general *n*-way case. Finally, advantages and disadvantages of the new methods are considered.

Some Results on the Behavior of Alternate Covariance Structure Estimation Procedures in the Presence of Non-Normal Data, SUBHASH SHARMA, SRINIVAS DURVASULA, and WILLIAM R. DILLON, May, 214–221.

See "Regression and Other Statistical Techniques"

When Choice Models Fail: Compensatory Models in Negatively Correlated Environments, ERIC J. JOHNSON, ROBERT J. MEYER, and SANJOY GHOSE, August, 255–270.

See "Brand Choice"

INDUSTRIAL MARKETING

Organizational Climate and Decision Framing: An Integrated Approach to Analyzing Industrial Buying Decisions, WILLIAM J. QUALLS and CHRISTOPHER P. PUTO, May, 179–192.

The authors examine the ability of prospect theory to explain industrial buyer decision behavior and explore the benefits of using organizational climate as one of the factors affecting the decision-framing process of industrial buyers. They develop a conceptual model of the industrial buying decision process, hypothesizing that factors such as the organizational climate and the buyer's general orientation toward risk affect the decision frame and, subsequently, the buyer's choice. The model was tested empirically in a field experiment using a national sample of industrial buyers. The results for the experimentally manipulated factors support the hypotheses about the way industrial buyers form decision reference points, compare alternatives, and eventually make choices. The results for the organizational climate factors, which were measured rather than manipulated experimentally, are mixed.

INFORMATION PROCESSING

The Effects of Concurrent Verbalization on Choice Processing, GABRIEL BIEHAL and DIPANKAR CHAKRAVARTI, February, 84–96.
See "Brand Choice"

The Information Processing of Coordinated Media Campaigns, JULIE A. EDELL and KEVIN LANE KELLER, May, 149–163.
See "Advertising and Media Research"

INTERNATIONAL MARKETING

Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct? C. MIN HAN, May, 222–229.
See "Buyer Behavior"

MARKETING MANAGEMENT

Judgments of Marketing Professionals About Ethical Issues in Marketing Research: A Replication and Extension, ISHMAEL P. AKAAH and EDWARD A. RIORDAN, February, 112–120.
See "Research Ethics"

Knowledge Bases and Salesperson Effectiveness: A Script-Theoretic Analysis, SIEW MENG LEONG, PAUL S. BUSCH, and DEBORAH ROEDDER JOHN, May, 164–178.
See "Salesforce Research"

Marketing Jobs and Management Controls: Toward a Framework, BERNARD J. JAWORSKI and DEBORAH J. MacINNIS, November, 406–419.

The authors consider the relationships among two characteristics associated with senior marketing positions (procedural knowledge and performance documentation), four types of management controls, and three job-related minipathologies (job tension, dysfunctional behaviors, and information asymmetries between superiors and subordinates). Selected management control theory suggests that the characteristics of a given marketing position should predict managers' reliance on specific types of management controls. In turn, these controls should directly predict the extent of job-related minipathologies. In contrast, contingency theories of control suggest that task characteristics moderate the direct effects of controls on these negative outcomes. In effect, they argue that whether outcomes are positive or negative depends on the extent to which controls "fit" a given marketing position. To test these ideas, a national survey of senior marketing personnel was conducted. Three sets of findings emerged. First, the two task characteristics studied generally predict the type of controls-in-use. Second, certain controls-in-use have a modest effect on specific minipathologies. Third, the moderating effect of task characteristics is not confirmed. Implications for marketing practice and directions for future research in marketing are proposed.

Salesforce Compensation: An Empirical Investigation of Factors Related to Use of Salary Versus Incentive Compensation, GEORGE JOHN and BARTON WEITZ, February, 1–14.
See "Salesforce Research"

MEASUREMENT

A Bootstrap Procedure for Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indices of Structural Equation and Confirmatory Factor Models, PAULA FITZGERALD BONE, SUBHASH SHARMA, and TERENCE A. SHIMP, February, 105–111.
See "Econometric Models"

Measuring Consumer Attitudes Toward the Marketplace With Tailored Interviews, SIVA K. BALASUBRAMANIAN and WAGNER A. KAMAKURA, August, 311–326.
See "Sampling and Survey Research"

Reliability of Nominal Data Based on Qualitative Judgments, WILLIAM D. PERREAULT, JR. and LAURENCE E. LEIGH, May, 135–148.

Most research related to the reliability and validity of marketing measures has focused on multi-item quantitative scales. In contrast, little attention has been given to the quality of nominal scale data developed from qualitative judgments. Judgment-based ("coded") nominal scale data are important and frequently used in marketing research—for example, in analysis of consumer responses to open-ended survey questions, in cognitive response research, in meta-analysis, and in content analysis. The authors address opportunities and challenges involved in evaluating and improving the quality of judgment-based nominal scale data, with specific emphasis on the use of multiple judges. They review approaches commonly used in other disciplines, then develop a new index of reliability that is more appropriate for the type of interjudge data typically found in marketing studies. Data from a cognitive response experiment are used to illustrate the new index and compare it with other common measures. The authors conclude with suggestions on how to improve the design of studies that rely on judgment-coded data.

NEW PRODUCT RESEARCH

Adjusting Stated Intention Measures to Predict Trial Purchase of New Products: A Comparison of Models and Methods, LINDA F. JAMIESON and FRANK M. BASS, August, 336–345.

Several of the largest marketing research suppliers estimate that 70 to 90% of their clients use purchase intention scales in some form on a regular basis. Though there have been many studies of purchase intention, relatively few researchers have tried to relate purchase intention to actual purchase behavior. Those who have attempted to relate the two often have found substantial variation between stated intention and actual behavior. The authors have collected what they believe is the largest and most comprehensive database on purchase intention and actual purchase behavior for new products yet developed. They use different models in a comparison of predictive accuracy when stated intentions data are adjusted by separate perceptions of products such as willingness to consult others before purchase, affordability, liking, and availability.

PRICING RESEARCH

The Relationship Between Perceived and Objective Price-Quality, DONALD R. LICHTENSTEIN and SCOT BURTON, November, 429–443.
See "Buyer Behavior"

REGRESSION AND OTHER STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

A Bootstrap Procedure for Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indices of Structural Equation and Confirmatory Factor Models, PAULA FITZGERALD BONE, SUBHASH SHARMA, and TERENCE A. SHIMP, February, 105–111.

See "Econometric Models"

A Monté Carlo Comparison of Estimators for the Multinomial Logit Model, DAVID S. BUNCH and RICHARD R. BATSELL, February, 56–68.

See "Econometric Models"

Commentary on Biasing Effects of Pilot Samples and Gillett's Observations on the Stein Confidence Interval, ARTHUR J. ADAMS and RONALD E. SHIFFLER, May, 241–243.

See "Sampling and Survey Methods"

Confidence Interval Construction by Stein's Method: A Practical and Economical Approach to Sample Size Determination, RAPHAEL GILLETT, May, 237–240.

See "Sampling and Survey Methods"

Cross-Validation Assessment of Alternatives to Individual-Level Conjoint Analysis: A Case Study, PAUL E. GREEN and KRISTIAAN HELSEN, August, 346–350.

Recently, both Hagerty and Kamakura have proposed insightful suggestions for improving the predictive accuracy of conjoint analysis via various types of averaging of individual responses. Hagerty uses Q-type fator analysis (i.e., optimal weighting) and Kamakura a hierarchical cluster analysis that optimizes predictive validity. Both approaches are compared with conventional conjoint and self-explicated utility models using real datasets. Neither the Hagerty nor the Kamakura suggestions lead to higher predictive validities than are obtained by conventional conjoint analysis applied to individual response data.

LADI: A Latent Discriminant Model for Analyzing Marketing Research Data, WILLIAM R. DILLON and NARENDRA MULANI, February, 15–29.

See "Segmentation Research"

Reliability of Nominal Data Based on Qualitative Judgments, WILLIAM D. PERREAULT, JR. and LAURENCE E. LEIGH, May, 135–148.

See "Measurement"

Reply to Greenacre's Commentary on the Carroll-Green-Schaffer Scaling of Two-Way Correspondence Analysis Solutions, J. DOUGLAS CARROLL, PAUL E. GREEN, and CATHERINE M. SCHAFFER, August, 366–368.

See "Scaling"

Some Results on the Behavior of Alternate Covariance Structure Estimation Procedures in the Presence of Non-Normal Data, SUBHASH SHARMA, SRINIVAS DURVASULA, and WILLIAM R. DILLON, May, 214–221.

The authors report some results on the behavior of alternative covariance structure estimation procedures in the presence of non-normal data. They conducted Monté Carlo simulation experiments with a factorial deisgn involving three levels of skewness, three level of kurtosis, and three different sample sizes. For normal data, among all the elliptical estimation techniques, elliptical reweighted least squares (ERLS) was equivalent in performance to ML. However, as expected, for non-normal data parameter estimates were unbiased for ML and the elliptical estimation techniques, whereas the bias in standard errors was substantial for GLS and ML. Among elliptical estimation techniques, ERLS was superior in performance. On the basis of the simulation results, the authors recommend that researchers use ERLS for both normal and non-normal data.

The Carroll-Green-Schaffer Scaling in Correspondence Analysis: A Theoretical and Empirical Appraisal, MICHAEL J. GREENACRE, August, 358–365.

See "Scaling"

RESEARCH DESIGN

Mood Manipulation in Marketing Research: An Examination of Potential Confounding Effects, RONALD PAUL HILL and JAMES C. WARD, February, 97–104.

See "Buyer Behavior"

On the Use of Structural Equation Models in Experimental Designs, RICHARD P. BAGOZZI and YOUJAE YI, August, 271–284.

See "Econometric Models"

RESEARCH ETHICS

Judgments of Marketing Professionals About Ethical Issues in Marketing Research: A Replication and Extension, ISHMAEL P. AKAAH and EDWARD A. RIORDAN, February, 112–120.

The authors examine, in the context of Crawford's 1970 study, changes in marketing professionals' research ethics judgments and the influence of organizational factors on those judgments. The results indicate several significant changes in ethical judgments. In addition, they suggest that three organizational factors—extent of ethical problems within the organization, top management actions on ethics, and organizational role (researchers vs. executives)—underlie differences in ethical judgments.

SALESFORCE RESEARCH

Knowledge Bases and Salesperson Effectiveness: A Script-Theoretic Analysis, SIEW MENG LEONG, PAUL S. BUSCH, and DEBORAH ROEDDER JOHN, May, 164–178.

Salesperson effectiveness in customer interaction is evaluated from a script-theoretic perspective. Differences in salesperson performance are traced to differences in knowledge of the actions and events across and within sales situations and the salesperson's ability to abstract from relevant previous experience. Results of two experiments conducted in an insurance context indicte that, as hypothesized, high effective salespeople provided more elaborate, distinctive, contingent, and hypothetical scripts than low effective salespeople. Moreover, these effects were accentuated in less typical sales situations, as suggested by results in the homeowner's insurance but not the life insurance experiment. Theoretical, methodological, and managerial implications of the findings are discussed.

Salesforce Compensation: An Empirical Investigation of Factors Related to Use of Salary Versus Incentive Compensation, GEORGE JOHN and BARTON WEITZ, February, 1–14.

The transaction cost analysis framework is integrated with prescriptions from the sales management literature to develop a model that indicates the role of salary in a sales compensation plan for industrial firms. The descriptive power of the model is examined by surveying compensation practices in 161 firms. The results indicate that the transaction cost framework is somewhat useful in describing the use of salary, but the framework does not consider some important aspects guiding salary versus incentive compensation decisions.

SAMPLING AND SURVEY METHODS

Commentary on Biasing Effects of Pilot Samples and Gillett's Observations on the Stein Confidence Interval, ARTHUR J. ADAMS and RONALD E. SHIFFLER, May, 241–243.

A previous note demonstrated that correctable bias is present when pilot sample information is used to establish sample size. Though Gillett claims that the Stein approach is a superior method for establishing sample size, we argue that it pursues an artificial goal, is impractical, and is subject to the underachievement effect that prompted our original note.

Confidence Interval Construction by Stein's Method: A Practical and Economical Approach to Sample Size Determination, RAPHAEL GILLETT, May, 237–240.

A two-stage method of confidence interval construction developed by Stein is a practical and straightforward approach to sample size determination when one wants to estimate the mean of a normal distribution of unknown mean and variance. The technique has several advantages over the modified version of current informal practice proposed by Shiffler and Adams in a recent *JMR* article: (1) the need for correction factors is eliminated, (2) the precision of the confidence interval is fixed rather than uncertain and the desired level of confidence is guaranteed, irrespective of the unknown population variance, and (3) a sound theoretical basis is provided for making an economical choice of sample size.

Measuring Consumer Attitudes Toward the Marketplace With Tailored Interviews, SIVA K. BALASUBRAMANIAN and WAGNER A. KAMAKURA, August, 311–326.

The authors demonstrate how item response theory can be applied for cost effective measurement of consumer attitudes with multi-item scales. The measurement technique they discuss and illustrate is tailored to each respondent so that each is asked only the scale items most informative of his or her attitude level. This approach yields attitude estimates from only a fraction of the total number of items in the attitude scale, with a measurable and controllable increase in the standard error of measurement. Potential cost-saving implications are discussed.

The Effect of Mixed Grammar Chains on Responses to Survey Questions, JAMES H. BARNES, JR. and MICHAEL J. DOTSON, November, 468–472.

Reports of the use of mixed grammar chains in survey research have become common in the literature. An investigation of the misunderstanding by respondents as the result of such usage suggests that researchers may not fully appreciate the nature and impact of this form of bias introduced into their results.

SCALING METHODS

Reply to Greenacre's Commentary on the Carroll-Green-Schaffer Scaling of Two-Way Correspondence Analysis Solutions, J. DOUGLAS CARROLL, PAUL E. GREEN, and CATHERINE M. SCHAFFER, August, 366–368.

The authors consider Greenacre's criticisms of the CGS scaling of two-way correspondence analysis. They suggest that Greenacre's indictment of this scaling approach also implies an indictment of multiple correspondence analysis interpretations—interpretations that have been made by him (and by other contributors to correspondence analysis) prior to the publication of their articles.

The Carroll-Green-Schaffer Scaling in Correspondence Analysis: A Theoretical and Empirical Appraisal, MICHAEL J. GREENACRE, August, 358–365.

In two recent *JMR* articles, Carroll, Green, and Schaffer have proposed an alternative scaling of the coordinates in the correspondence analysis of a contingency table. This "CGS scaling" is claimed to allow interpoint distance comparisons both "within sets" (i.e., row-to-row and column-to-column distances) and "between sets" (i.e., row-to-column distances). The author shows by a theoretical argument and by means of a simple practical example that the rationale on which this scaling is based is incorrect.

SEGMENTATION RESEARCH

A Probabilistic Choice Model for Market Segmentation and Elasticity Structure, WAGNER A. KAMAKURA and GARY J. RUSSELL, November, 379–390.

Marketing scholars commonly characterize market structure by studying the patterns of substitution implied by brand switching. Though the approach is useful, it typically ignores the destabilizing role of marketing variables (e.g., price) in switching behavior. The authors propose a flexible choice model that partitions the market into consumer segments differing in both brand perference and price sensitivity. The result is a unified description of market structure that links the pattern of brand switching to the magnitudes of own- and cross-price elasticities. The approach is applied in a study of competition between national brands and private labels in one product category.

An Approach for Tracking Within-Segment Shifts in Market Shares, RAJIV GROVER and V. SRINIVASAN, May, 230–236.

Most approaches to examining the effects of marketing variables on market shares treat the market as a single aggregate. Examining the marketing effects at the segment level would be more useful managerially. Recently, Grover and Srinivasan proposed that a market segment be defined as a group of consumers homogeneous in terms of the probabilities of choosing the different brands in a product class. The market is thereby segmented into brand loyal segments and multiple switching segments. The authors extend this approach to allow the within-switching-segment market shares to vary across periods. The changes over time in within-segment market shares are related to marketing variables such as price and promotion through a logit model. Application of the model to data from a scanner panel shows that the proposed approach produces a modest improvement in predictive validity in comparison with the traditional approach of treating the market as a single aggregate.

LADI: A Latent Discriminant Model for Analyzing Marketing Research Data, WILLIAM R. DILLON and NARENDRA MULANI, February, 15–29.

A general, flexible LAtent DIscriminant model is described. LADI is a model-based clustering procedure, derived from a specific conceptualization in which the discrimination problem is viewed in a *latent mixture* context. The basic model yields maximum likelihood (ML) estimates of mixing parameters and structural parameters that define the latent clusters in terms of the responses to a set of descriptor variables. Among other features, the model accommodates descriptor variables having different scale properties, allows for the investigation of group structure, provides a statistical test of the number of latent clusters to retain, and allows for constraints to be imposed on the solution.

SOCIAL ISSUES AND PUBLIC POLICY

Interactive Impact of Informational and Normative Influence on Donations, STEPHEN A. LaTOUR and AJAY K. MANRAI, August, 327–335.

See "Buyer Behavior"

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

Competitive Reactions to Market Entry: Explaining Interfirm Differences, HUBERT GATIGNON, ERIN ANDERSON, and KRISTIAAN HELSEN, February, 44–54.

Competitive reactions are recognized as a driving force influencing marketing decisions. The authors seek to explain how established competitors in an oligopoly react to a significant new entry in their market. It has been suggested that at least some established competitors will react to a market entry positively and at least some competitors will react negatively or not at all. Both theory and evidence suggest that not all firms will react to an entry in the same way. The authors posit that interfirm differences in competitive reactions to entry can be predicted by observing, for each competitor, the elasticity of each marketing mix variable. Competitors will retaliate with their effective marketing mix "weapons" and retreat with their ineffective marketing instruments. These predictions are tested by estimating the parameters of an econometric model of demand response functions and reaction functions with data from the market for an over-the-counter gynecological product and from the airline industry. Results, replicated in the two markets, are substantially consistent with predictions.

Consumer Preference Formation and Pioneering Advantage, GREGORY S. CARPENTER and KENT NAKAMOTO, August, 285–298.
See "Buyer Behavior"

The Effects of Brand Positioning Strategies on Consumers' Brand and Category Perceptions: Some Insights From Schema Research, MITA SUJAN and JAMES R. BETTMAN, November, 454–467.
See "Brand Choice"

AUTHOR/TITLE INDEX*

ADAMS, ARTHUR J. and RONALD D. SHIFFLER, Commentary on Biasing Effects of Pilot Samples and Gillett's Observations on the Stein Confidence Interval, May, 241–243.
AKAAH, ISHMAEL P. and EDWARD A. RIORDAN, Judgments of Marketing Professionals About Ethical Issues in Marketing Research: A Replication and Extension, February, 112–120.
ALBAUM, GERALD, BRIDGER, Version 1.0; SIMGRAF, Version 1.0, November, 486–488, r.
———, Proceedings of the Sawtooth Software Conference on Perceptual Mapping, Conjoint Analysis, and Computer Interviewing, May, 250–251, r.
ALLEN, CHRIS T. and CHRIS A. JANISZEWSKI, Assessing the Role of Contingency Awareness in Attitudinal Conditioning With Implications for Advertising Research, February, 30–43.
ANDERSON, ERIN, see GATIGNON.

BAGOZZI, RICHARD P. and YOUJAE YI, On the Use of Structural Equation Models in Experimental Designs, August, 271–284.
BALASUBRAMANIAN, SIVA K. and WAGNER A. KAMAKURA, Measuring Consumer Attitudes Toward the Marketplace With Tailored Interviews, August, 311–326.
BARNES, JAMES H., JR. and MICHAEL J. DOTSON, The Effect of Mixed Grammar Chains on Responses to Survey Questions, November, 468–472.
BASS, FRANK M., see JAMIESON.
BATSELL, RICHARD R., see BUNCH.
BETTMAN, JAMES R., see SUJAN.
BIEHAL, GABRIEL and DIPANKAR CHAKRAVARTI, The Effects of Concurrent Verbalization on Choice Processing, February, 84–96.
BLAIR, ED, How Many Subjects?, by Helena Chmura Kraemer and Sue Thiemann, May, 248, r.
———, Randomized Response (Theory and Techniques), by Arijit Chaudhuri and Rahul Mukerjee, November, 484–485, r.
BLOCH, PETER H., Systat 4.0 MS-DOS, Sygraph 1.0 MS-DOS, Systat 3.2 MacIntosh With Graphics, August, 375–376, r.
BONE, PAULA FITZGERALD, SUBHASH SHARMA, and TERENCE A. SHIMP, A Bootstrap Procedure for Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indices of Structural Equation and Confirmatory Factor Models, February, 105–111.

BUCKLIN, RANDOLPH E., see LATTIN.
BUNCH, DAVID S. and RICHARD R. BATSELL, A Monté Carlo Comparison of Estimators for the Multinomial Logit Model, February, 56–68.
BURKE, MARIAN CHAPMAN and JULIE A. EDELL, The Impact of Feelings on Ad-Based Affect and Cognition, February, 69–83.
BURTON, SCOT, see LICHTENSTEIN.
BUSCH, PAUL S., see LEONG.

CAMPION, WILLIAM M., Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys, by Donald B. Rubin, November, 485–486, r.
CARPENTER, GREGORY S. and KENT NAKAMOTO, Consumer Preference Formation and Pioneering Advantage, August, 285–298.
CARROLL, J. DOUGLAS, PAUL E. GREEN, and CATHERINE M. SCHAFFER, Reply to Greenacre's Commentary on the Carroll-Green-Schaffer Scaling of Two-Way Correspondence Analysis Solutions, August, 366–368.
CHAKRAVARTI, DIPANKAR, see BIEHAL.
COLLINS, ROBERT H., EXP: The Scientific Word Processor, Version 1.11, by Simon L. Smith and Walter L. Smith, May, 251–252, r.

DANAHER, PETER J., An Approximate Log-Linear Model for Predicting Magazine Audiences, November, 473–479.
DILLON, WILLIAM R., see SHARMA.
——— and NARENDRA MULANI, LADI: A Latent Discriminant Model for Analyzing Marketing Research Data, February, 15–29.
DOTSON, MICHAEL J., see BARNES.
DRÖGE, CORNELIA, Shaping the Route to Attitude Change: Central Versus Peripheral Processing Through Comparative Versus Noncomparative Advertising, May, 193–204.
DURVASULA, SRINIVAS, see SHARMA.

EDELL, JULIE A., see BURKE.
——— and KEVIN LANE KELLER, The Information Processing of Coordinated Media Campaigns, May, 149–163.

GATIGNON, HUBERT, ERIN ANDERSON, and KRISTIAAN HELSEN, Competitive Reactions to Market Entry: Explaining Interfirm Differences, February, 44–55.
GHOSE, SANJOY, see JOHNSON.
GILLETT, RAPHAEL, Confidence Interval Construction by Stein's Method: A Practical and Economical Approach to Sample Size Determination, May, 237–240.

*r indicates book or software review.

GILLY, MARY C., Research in Health Care Settings, by Kathleen E. Grady and Barbara Strudler Wallston, November, 483–484, r.
GREEN, PAUL E., see CARROLL.
——— and KRISTIAAN HELSEN, Cross-Validation Assessment of Alternatives to Individual-Level Conjoint Analysis: A Case Study, August, 346–350.
GREENACRE, MICHAEL J., The Carroll-Green-Schaffer Scaling in Correspondence Analysis: A Theoretical and Empirical Appraisal, August, 358–365.
GROVER, RAJIV and V. SRINIVASAN, An Approach for Tracking Within-Segment Shifts in Market Shares, May, 230–236.

HAN, C. MIN, Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct?, May, 222–229.
HAUSER, JOHN R. and BIRGER WERNERFELT, The Competitive Implications of Relevant-Set/Response Analysis, November, 391–405.
HELSEN, KRISTIAAN, see GATIGNON; see Green.
HERTZOG, CHRISTOPHER, Structural Equation Modeling With LISREL: Essentials and Advances, by Leslie A. Hayduk, August, 369–370, r.
HIGGINS, SUSAN K., Cheap But Good Marketing Research, by Alan R. Andreasen, August, 372–372, r.
HILL, RONALD PAUL and JAMES C. WARD, Mood Manipulation in Marketing Research: An Examination of Potential Confounding Effects, February, 97–104.
HOZIER, GEORGE C., Jr., Reseller Assortment Decision Criteria, by Jerker Nilsson and Viggo Host, February, 129, r.

JAMIESON, LINDA F. and FRANK M. BASS, Adjusting Stated Intention Measures to Predict Trial Purchase of New Products: A Comparison of Models and Methods, August, 336–345.
JANISZEWSKI, CHRIS A., see ALLEN.
JAWORSKI, BERNARD J. and DEBORAH J. MacINNIS, Marketing Jobs and Management Controls: Toward a Framework, November, 406–419.
JOHN, DEBORAH ROEDDER, see LEONG.
JOHN, GEORGE and BARTON WEITZ, Salesforce Compensation: An Empirical Investigation of Factors Related to Use of Salary Versus Incentive Compensation, February, 1–14.
JOHNSON, ERIC J., ROBERT J. MEYER, and SANJOY GHOSE, When Choice Models Fail: Compensatory Models in Negatively Correlated Environments, August, 255–270.

KAMAKURA, WAGNER A., see BALASUBRAMANIAN.
——— and GARY J. RUSSELL, A Probabilistic Choice Model for Market Segmentation and Elasticity Structure, November, 379–390.
KELLER, KEVIN LANE, see EDELL.
KUMAR, AJITH and C. M. SASHI, Confirmatory Analysis of Aggregate Hierarchical Market Structures: Inferences From Brand-Switching Behavior, November, 444–453.

LaTOUR, STEPHEN A. and AJAY K. MANRAI, Interactive Impact of Informational and Normative Influence on Donations, August, 327–335.
LATTIN, JAMES M. and RANDOLPH E. BUCKLIN, Reference Effects of Price and Promotion on Brand Choice Behavior, August, 327–335.
LAVINE, MINNA, Data Desk Professional, Version 2.0; EXSTATIX, Version 1.2; MACSS, Version 1.2; STATVIEW SE+GRAPHICS and STATVIEW II, Version 1.03; FASTAT, Version 1.1; November, 488–492, r.
LEHMANN, DONALD R., see MOORE.
LEIGH, LAURENCE E., see PERREAULT.
LEONG, SIEW MENG, PAUL S. BUSCH, and DEBORAH ROEDDER JOHN, Knowledge Bases and Salesperson Effectiveness: A Script-Theoretic Analysis, May, 164–178.
LICHTENSTEIN, DONALD R. and SCOT BURTON, The Relationship Between Perceived and Objective Price-Quality, November, 429–443.

MacINNIS, DEBORAH, see JAWORSKI.
MacLACHLAN, DOUGLAS L., Common Problems/Proper Solutions, J. Scott Long, ed. August, 370–371, r.
MAGIDSON, JAY, Latent Class Analysis, by Allan L. McCutcheon, February, 125–126, r.
MANRAI, AJAY K., see LaTOUR.
McQUARRIE, EDWARD F., Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research, by Richard A. Krueger, August, 371–372, r.
———, The Practical Handbook and Guide to Focus Group Research, by Thomas L. Greenbaum; Focus Groups: A Guide for Marketing and Advertising Professionals, by Jane Farley Templeton; February, 121–125, r.
MEYER, ROBERT J., see JOHNSON.
MONROE, KENT B., see RAO.
MOORE, WILLIAM L. and DONALD R. LEHMANN, A Paired Comparison Nested Logit Model of Individual Preference Structures, November, 420–428.
MULANI, NARENDRA, see DILLON.
MURPHY, PATRICK E., Ethics and Values in Applied Social Research, by Allan J. Kimmel, November, 482–483, r.

NAKAMOTO, KENT, see CARPENTER.
NESLIN, SCOTT A. and ROBERT W. SHOEMAKER, An Alternative Explanation for Lower Repeat Rates After Promotion Purchases, May, 205–213.

PATTI, CHARLES H., Nonverbal Communication in Advertising, edited by Sidney Hecker and David W. Stewart, February, 128, r.
PERREAULT, WILLIAM D., JR. and LAURENCE E. LEIGH, Reliability of Nominal Data Based on Qualitative Judgments, May, 135–148.
PUTO, CHRISTOPHER P., see QUALLS.

QUALLS, WILLIAM J. and CHRISTOPHER PUTO, Organizational Climate and Decision Framing: An Integrated Approach to Analyzing Industrial Buying Decisions, May, 179–192.

RAO, AKSHAY R. and KENT B. MONROE, The Effect of Price, Brand Name, and Store Name on Buyers' Perceptions of Product Quality: An Integrative Review, August, 351–357.
RICHARDS, LARRY E., Statistical Analysis With Missing Data, by Roderick J. A. Little and Donald B. Rubin, August, 374–375, r.
RIORDAN, EDWARD A., see AKAAH.
ROOK, DENNIS W., Marketing and Semiotics: New Directions in the Study of Signs for Sale, Jean Umiker-Sebeok, Editor, August, 373–374, r.
RUSSELL, GARY J., see KAMAKURA.

SASHI, C. M., see KUMAR.
SCHAFFER, CATHERINE M., see CARROLL.
SHARMA, SUBHASH, see BONE.
———, SRINIVAS DURVASULA, and WILLIAM R. DILLON, Some Results on the Behavior of Alternate Covariance Structure Estimation Procedures in the Presence of Non-Normal Data, May, 214–221.
SHERRY, JOHN F., JR., Culture and Consumption: New Ap-

proaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities, by Grant McCracken, May, 245–246, r.
SHIFFLER, RONALD E., see ADAMS.
SHIMP, TERENCE A., see BONE.
SHOEMAKER, ROBERT W., see NESLIN.
SPROLES, GEORGE B., The Frontier of Research in the Consumer Interest, E. Scott Maynes, Editor, May, 246–248, r.
SRINIVASAN, V., see GROVER.
STECKEL, JOEL H., The Application of Regression Analysis, by Dick R. Wittink, November, 480–482, r.
STERN, BRUCE L., Research for Marketing Decisions, by Paul E. Green, Donald S. Tull, and Gerald Albaum, May, 248–249.
STEWART, DAVID W., Q Methodology, by Bruce McKeown and Dan Thomas, May, 249–250, r.
SUJAN, MITA and JAMES R. BETTMAN, The Effects of Brand Positioning Strategies on Consumers' Brand and Category Perceptions: Some Insights From Schema Research, November, 454–467.

WARD, JAMES C., see HILL.
WEITZ, BARTON, see JOHN.
WERNERFELT, BIRGER, see HAUSER.
WILEY, JAMES B., SmartForecasts II, Forecast Plus, SPSS/PC+ Trends, Forecast Master, February, 129–132, r.
WITTINK, DICK R., Analyzing Decision Making: Metric Conjoint Analysis, by Jordan J. Louviere, May, 244–245, r.

YALCH, RICHARD F., Social Information Processing and Survey Methodology, edited by Hans J. Hippler, Norbert Schwartz, and Seymour Sudman, February, 126–128, r.
YI, YOUJAE, see BAGOZZI.

BOOKS AND SOFTWARE REVIEWED

Books

Albaum, Gerald, see Green.
Andreasen, Alan R., *Cheap But Good Marketing Research*, Susan K. Higgins, August, 372–373.
Chaudhuri, Arijit and Rahul Mukerjee, *Randomized Response* (Theory and Techniques), Ed Blair, November, 484–485.
Grady, Kathleen E. and Barbara Strudler Wallston, *Research in Health Care Settings*, Mary C. Gilly, November, 483–484.
Green, Paul E., Donald S. Tull, and Gerald Albaum, *Research for Marketing Decisions*, Bruce L. Stern, May, 248–249.
Greenbaum, Thomas L., *The Practical Handbook and Guide to Focus Group Research*, Edward F. McQuarrie, February, 121–125.
Hayduk, Leslie A., *Structural Equation Modeling With LISREL: Essentials and Advances*, Christopher Hertzog, August, 369–370.
Hecker, Sidney and David W. Stewart, editors, *Nonverbal Communication in Advertising*, Charles H. Patti, February, 128.
Hippler, Hans J., Norbert Schwartz, and Seymour Sudman, editors, *Social Information Processing and Survey Methodology*, Richard F. Yalch, February, 126–128.
Host, Viggo, see Nilsson.
Kimmel, Allan J., *Ethics and Values in Applied Social Research*, Patrick E. Murphy, November, 482–483.
Kraemer, Helena Chmura and Sue Thiemann, *How Many Subjects?*, Ed Blair, May, 248.
Krueger, Richard A., *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*, Edward F. McQuarrie, August, 371–372.
Little, Roderick J. A. and Donald B. Rubin, *Statistical Analysis With Missing Data*, Larry E. Richard, August, 374–375.
Long, J. Scott, ed., *Common Problems/Proper Solutions*, Douglas L. MacLachlan, August, 370–371.
Louviere, Jordan J., *Analyzing Decision Making: Metric Conjoint Analysis*, Dick R. Wittink, May, 244–245.
Maynes, E. Scott, Editor, *The Frontier of Research in the Consumer Interest*, George B. Sproles, May, 146–148.
McCracken, Grant, *Culture and Consumption: New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities*, John F. Sherry, Jr., May, 245–246.
McCutcheon, Allan L., *Latent Class Analysis*, Jay Magidson, February, 125–126.
McKeown, Bruce and Dan Thomas, *Q Methodology*, David W. Stewart, May, 249–250.
Mukerjee, Rahul, see Chaudhuri.
Nilsson, Jerker and Viggo Host, *Reseller Assortment Decision Criteria*, George C. Hozier, Jr., February, 129.
Proceedings of the Sawtooth Software Conference on Perceptual Mapping, Conjoint Analysis, and Computer Interviewing, Gerald Albaum, May, 250–251.
Rubin, Donald B., *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*, William M. Campion, November, 485–486.
———, see Little.
Schwartz, Norbert, see Hippler.
Stewart, David W., see Hecker.
Sudman, Seymour, see Hippler.
Templeton, Jane Farley, *Focus Groups: A Guide for Marketing and Advertising Professionals*, Edward F. McQuarrie, February, 121–125.
Thiemann, Sue, see Thiemann.
Thomas, Dan, see McKeown.
Tull, Donald S., see Green.
Umiker-Sebeok, Jean, Editor, *Marketing and Semiotics: New Directions in the Study of Signs for Sale*, Dennis W. Rook, August, 373–374.
Wallston, Barbara Strudler, see Grady.
Wittink, Dick R., *The Application of Regression Analysis*, Joel H. Steckel, November, 480–482.

Software

BRIDGER, Version 1.0, Gerald Albaum, November, 486–488.
Data Desk Professional, Version 2.0, Revision 5, Minna Lavine, November, 488–492.
EXP: The Scientific Word Processor, Version 1.11, Robert H. Collins, May, 151–152.
EXSTATIX, Version 1.2, Minna Lavine, November, 488–492.
FASTAT, Version 1.1, Minna Lavine, November, 488–492.
Forecast Master, James B. Wiley, February, 129–132.
Forecast Plus, James B. Wiley, February, 129–132.
MACSS, Version 1.2, Minna Lavine, November, 488–492.
SIMGRAF, Version 1.0, Gerald Albaum, November, 486–488.
SmartForecasts II, James B. Wiley, February, 129–132.
SPSS/PC+ Trends, James B. Wiley, February, 129–132.
STATVIEW SE+GRAPHICS and STATVIEW II, Version 1.03, Minna Levine, November, 488–492.
Sygraph 1.0 MS-DOS, Peter H. Bloch, August, 375–376.
Systat 3.2 MacIntosh With Graphics, Peter H. Bloch, August, 375–376.
Systat 4.0 MS-DOS, Peter H. Bloch, August, 375–376.

Reprint No. JMR264110